

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ARTHUR MAYO,

Case No.: 2:16-cv-00047-APG-VCF

Plaintiff

Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration

V.

[ECF No. 76]

WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendants

I previously granted the defendants' motion for partial summary judgment. ECF No. 73.

Plaintiff Arthur Mayo moves for reconsideration of that order. ECF No. 76.

Reconsideration of an interlocutory order is permitted under Federal Rule of Civil

11 Procedure 54(b). The party requesting reconsideration must show “(1) some valid reason why
12 the court should revisit its prior order; and (2) facts or law of a ‘strongly convincing nature’ in
13 support of reversing the prior decision.” *USF Ins. Co. v. Smith’s Food & Drug Ctr., Inc.*, 2013
14 WL 4458776, at *1 (D. Nev. Aug. 16, 2013) (citation omitted). Similar to a Rule 59(e) motion,
15 “a motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless
16 the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there
17 is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229
18 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). A reconsideration motion “may not be used to
19 raise arguments or present evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been
20 raised earlier in the litigation.” *Id.*

Mr. Mayo has not presented any valid reason why I should reconsider my prior ruling. I

therefore deny the motion.

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 76)
2 **is DENIED.**

3 DATED this 22nd day of May, 2019.

4
5 
6 ANDREW P. GORDON
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23